

Rényi-entropic bounds on quantum communication

Wim van Dam* Patrick Hayden†

February 1, 2008

Abstract

In this article we establish new bounds on the quantum communication complexity of distributed problems. Specifically, we consider the amount of communication that is required to transform a bipartite state φ_{AB} into another, typically more entangled, ψ_{AB} . We obtain lower bounds in this setting by studying the *Rényi entropy* of the marginal density matrices of the distributed system.

The communication bounds on quantum state transformations also imply lower bounds for the model of communication complexity where the task consists of the distributed evaluation of a function $f(x, y)$. Our approach encapsulates several known lower bound methods that use the log-rank or the von Neumann entropy of the density matrices involved. The technique is also effective for proving lower bounds on problems involving a promise or for which the “hard” distributions of inputs are correlated. As examples, we show how to prove a nearly tight bound on the bounded-error quantum communication complexity of the inner product function in the presence of unlimited amounts of EPR-type entanglement and a similarly strong bound on the complexity of the shifted quadratic character problem.

1 Introduction

Quantum information theory investigates the power and limitations of quantum mechanics for communicating and processing information. In this article we look at the usefulness of quantum communication for the execution of distributed tasks in the presence of prior entanglement. More specifically, we will focus on the question how many quantum bits (qubits) two parties A and B need to exchange in order to create a joint quantum state ψ_{AB} . Our main tool will be the Rényi entropy of the marginal density matrix $\psi_A := \text{Tr}_B(\psi_{AB})$.

*Computer Science Division, Soda Hall, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720 (USA). Also at MSRI Berkeley and HP Palo Alto. Email: vandam@cs.berkeley.edu.

†Institute for Quantum Information, Caltech 107-81, Pasadena, CA 91125 (USA). Email: patrick@cs.caltech.edu.

1.1 Relation with Earlier Work

The quantum communication complexity of distributed state preparation has been discussed in [8]. In this article the authors gave a tight characterization of the number of bits that two parties need to exchange in order to approximate a joint state ψ_{AB} . This characterization relied critically on the assumption that initially A and B do not share any entanglement.

The setting in which the parties are allowed to use entanglement to assist their state preparation has been the topic of many investigations in the physics community. Typically, these articles concentrated on the possibility of creating ψ_{AB} under the restriction that only classical communication is allowed [3, 14, 28].

The quantum communication complexity of distributed functions was first considered in the work by Yao and Kremer [30, 17]. Kremer's work in particular demonstrated several lower bounds on the quantum communication complexity of distributed functions. The first example of a quantum protocol that requires less communication than any classical solution was described by Cleve and Buhrman in 1997 [7]. General lower bound techniques for quantum communication have been described in [2], [6], [8], [16], [20] and [25]. Specifically, the results in this paper can be interpreted as generalizing and refining the lower bound techniques of [2] and [8].

1.2 Tools from Quantum Information

In this paper we will often be concerned with pure states $\psi_{AB} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{AB}$ of a composite system AB . For any such state there exist orthonormal bases $\{|i_A\rangle\}$ on A and $\{|i_B\rangle\}$ on B such that $|\psi_{AB}\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i} |i_A\rangle |i_B\rangle$. This representation is known as the Schmidt decomposition. The degree of entanglement of ψ_{AB} is then naturally characterized by the spectrum $\{\lambda_i\}$ of the reduced density operator $\psi_A := \text{Tr}_B(\psi_{AB})$. (Since ψ_{AB} is pure, ψ_A and ψ_B have the same spectra.) In particular, $\log \text{rank}(\psi_A)$ and the von Neumann entropy $S(\psi_A) := -\text{Tr}(\psi_A \log \psi_A)$ have been extensively studied as “measures of entanglement”. Indeed, in the limit of large numbers of copies of the state ψ_{AB} , $S(\psi_A)$ completely characterizes the states reversibly convertible into ψ_{AB} using only local operations and classical communication [3].

Since we will be studying approximate transformations of quantum states and their connection to bounded-error quantum communication complexity, it will be helpful to introduce some distance measures from quantum information theory. The *Uhlmann fidelity* F between two states ρ and σ is defined by $F(\rho, \sigma) = \text{Tr}(\rho^{1/2} \sigma \rho^{1/2})^{1/2}$. The range of the Uhlmann fidelity is the interval $[0, 1]$, reaching the extreme values 0 and 1 for perfectly distinguishable and identical states, respectively. In the case of two pure states ϕ and ψ , the expression for F simplifies to $F(\phi, \psi) = |\langle\phi|\psi\rangle|$. Thus, the fidelity $F(\rho, \sigma)$ indicates how ‘close’ ρ and σ are. Furthermore, no quantum mechanical evolution decreases the fidelity between two states: $F(\rho, \sigma) \geq F(\Lambda(\rho), \Lambda(\sigma))$ for all states ρ, σ and all trace-preserving, completely positive mappings Λ [27, 15]. In particular, if

Λ is the partial trace Tr_B , this reduces to $F(\rho_A, \sigma_A) \leq F(\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB})$ for any bipartite states ρ_{AB} and σ_{AB} .

2 Quantum Communication Complexity of State Transformation and Distributed Computation

Our starting point will be the question of how much communication between two parties A and B is required to transform a joint quantum state φ_{AB} into another state ψ_{AB} . To distinguish between the settings where A and B are or are not allowed to use prior entanglement, we introduce the following three complexity measures:

Definition 2.1 *The transformation complexity, $\bar{Q}_\epsilon(\psi_{AB}|\varphi_{AB})$, is the minimum number of bits (quantum and classical) of communication required, starting from the known state $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle$ to produce an approximating state ψ'_{AB} such that $F(\psi_{AB}, \psi'_{AB}) > 1 - \epsilon$.*

When $\epsilon = 0$ this definition requires that the final state ψ'_{AB} be equal to ψ_{AB} . It is also worth emphasizing that this definition of $\bar{Q}_\epsilon$ does not allow A and B to have any prior entanglement other than that of their state φ . The following complexity definition does allow such a resource:

Definition 2.2 *The entanglement-enhanced transformation complexity $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^*$ of the two states ψ_{AB} and φ_{AB} is defined by*

$$\bar{Q}_\epsilon^*(\psi_{AB}|\varphi_{AB}) = \inf_{\omega_{AB}} \bar{Q}_\epsilon(\psi_{AB} \otimes \omega_{AB}|\varphi_{AB} \otimes \omega_{AB}), \quad (1)$$

where the infimum is taken over all possible bipartite pure states $|\omega_{AB}\rangle$.

A third version of transformation complexity concerns the usage of prior entanglement only in the form of ‘EPR-pairs’.

Definition 2.3 *The EPR-enhanced transformation complexity $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^{(*)}$ is defined by*

$$\bar{Q}_\epsilon^{(*)}(\psi_{AB}|\varphi_{AB}) = \inf_{\Phi_{AB}^k} \bar{Q}_\epsilon(\psi_{AB} \otimes \Phi_{AB}^k|\varphi_{AB} \otimes \Phi_{AB}^k), \quad (2)$$

where the infimum is taken over all maximally entangled states of any rank $|\Phi_{AB}^k\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{j=1}^k |j, j\rangle$.

An important feature of the two entanglement-enhanced complexities is the requirement that the entangled state ω_{AB} (or Φ_{AB}^k) be returned (with fidelity at least $1 - \epsilon$) after the transformation protocol. Without this requirement the definitions would be vacuous because in the setting where we are allowed to use arbitrary entangled states as a disposable resource we could always choose $\omega = \psi$ such that no communication is necessary.

Instead, we view the prior entanglement as a potential *catalyst*, which allows us to reduce the communication complexity of the state transformation without destroying the entanglement. The fact that such catalysis is possible in a non-trivial way was first pointed out in [14].

We will also make use of some shorthand notation to describe state transformations in which A and B do not share any initial state φ . The complexities of such *state preparations* will be denoted without the conditional φ : $\bar{Q}_\epsilon(\psi)$, $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^*(\psi)$ and $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^{(*)}(\psi)$.

The ‘quantum sampling complexity’ $\dot{\bar{Q}}_\epsilon(\psi)$ that was discussed in [2] concerned the (approximate) preparation of quantum states without the use of prior entanglement. Hence the $\dot{\bar{Q}}_\epsilon(\psi)$ complexity in that article equals the quantity $\bar{Q}_\epsilon(\psi)$ that we defined here.

In the next sections of this article we will prove a dramatic difference between the complexities $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^*$ and $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^{(*)}$. On the one hand, we will show that $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^*$ is always zero for every $\epsilon > 0$, while on the other hand we will describe several lower bound techniques for the complexity $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^{(*)}$.

The lower bounds on the EPR-enhanced transformation complexity will also give rise to several lower bounds on the *quantum communication complexity* for the distributed evaluation of Boolean functions $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. In this setting, Alice receives an input $x \in X$ and Bob gets $y \in Y$. The question then is how many bits Alice and Bob need to communicate for a (probabilistic) evaluation of the function value $f(x, y)$. The original version, in which only classical communication is allowed, was first introduced by Yao [29] and has developed rapidly since [18]. In the quantum context, it makes sense to allow Alice and Bob various combinations of quantum resources to complete the task, such as communication of qubits or pre-existing entanglement. More specifically, let us assume that Alice and Bob receive n bit inputs, so that $X = Y = \{0, 1\}^n$ and that there is a family of functions f , one for each n . We write $Q_\epsilon^*(f)$ to denote the number of qubits of communication, as a function of n , required to evaluate f with probability of success at least $1 - \epsilon$ on every input if Alice and Bob are allowed arbitrary pre-existing entanglement. We also write $Q_\epsilon^{(*)}(f)$ for the same function if Alice and Bob are initially allowed to share any maximally entangled state but not other types of entanglement.

The connection between the communication complexity of distributed functions and that of state transformations was first discussed in [8], where it was used to obtain a lower bound on the quantum communication complexity of the inner product function. We reproduce from [2] (with a small correction) the following version of the lower bound. In the context of pre-existing entanglement, the connection is between distributed function evaluation protocols that *consume* entanglement and state transformation protocols that are *catalyzed* by entanglement.

Lemma 2.4 (Transition lemma) *Let $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}$ be a (partial) function with quantum communication complexity $Q_\epsilon^*(f)$. For any ℓ_2 distribu-*

tion $\alpha : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ that has $\alpha_{xy} = 0$ where $f(x, y)$ is not properly defined and $\sum_{xy} |\alpha_{xy}|^2 = 1$, we define the two states $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle = \sum_{(x,y)} \alpha_{xy} |x, y\rangle$ and $|\psi_{AB}\rangle = \sum_{(x,y)} \alpha_{xy} f(x, y) |x, y\rangle$. The transformation complexity of these states is bounded from above by $\bar{Q}_{2\epsilon}^*(\psi|\varphi) \leq 2Q_\epsilon^*(f)$. Similarly, $\bar{Q}_{2\epsilon}^{(*)}(\psi|\varphi) \leq 2Q_\epsilon^{(*)}(f)$ and $\bar{Q}_{2\epsilon}(\psi|\varphi) \leq 2Q_\epsilon(f)$.

Proof Suppose that we have an m -bit protocol to compute f with error probability at most ϵ . First, A and B run this protocol on the distributed distribution φ_{AB} , which will produce the superposition $\sum_{(x,y)} \alpha_{xy} |x, y, f(x, y), g_{xy}\rangle$ where g_{xy} is the garbage that the protocol has produced. Next, the function value $f(x, y)$ is used for the phase changing operation $|x, y\rangle \mapsto f(x, y) |x, y\rangle$. Finally, the m -bit protocol is executed ‘in reverse’ to erase the garbage qubits $|f(x, y), g_{xy}\rangle$. The final result of this $2m$ -bit protocol is with fidelity $1 - 2\epsilon$ the desired state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{(x,y)} \alpha_{xy} |x, y\rangle$.

See the appendix of [2] for a more detailed analysis of the fidelity of this procedure. (Note however that fidelity error of the resulting $\bar{Q}$ -protocol is 2ϵ , not ϵ as mentioned in [2][Ambainis, private communication].) $\square$

3 Some Basic Observations

3.1 Embezzling entanglement

While the distinction drawn in the previous section between the functions $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^*$ and $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^{(*)}$ might appear to be academic at first, their behaviors are actually radically different: $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^*$ is identically zero for $\epsilon \neq 0$ but $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^{(*)}$ is not. In other words, transformation complexity is trivial in the presence of arbitrary entanglement but not in the presence of unlimited amounts of maximal entanglement. The reason for this striking difference lies in the remarkable properties of the family of states

$$|M(d)\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{H_d}} \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}} |j_A\rangle |j_B\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $H_d := \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{j}$ is chosen so that $|M(d)\rangle$ is normalized.

Theorem 3.1 (Embezzlement [9]) *If $\epsilon > 0$ is fixed and $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle$ is any entangled state, then for all sufficiently large d , $\bar{Q}_\epsilon(M(d) \otimes \varphi_{AB} | M(d)) = 0$. Consequently, $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^*$ is zero for all $\epsilon > 0$.*

Thus, it is possible to *embezzle* a copy of $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle$ from $|M(d)\rangle$, thereby removing a small amount of entanglement from the original state, while causing only an arbitrarily small disturbance ϵ to it. See [9] for a proof of this theorem.

3.2 One-round versus Multi-round Protocols

Lemma 3.2 *If there exists a bipartite quantum communication protocol that transforms the initial state $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle$ to final state $|\psi_{AB}\rangle$ that requires q qubits of communication, then there also exists a one-round protocol, q qubit protocol that establishes the mapping $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle \mapsto |\psi_{AB}\rangle$. Hence, the transformation complexities $\bar{Q}$ and $\bar{Q}^{(*)}$ are completely described by the complexities of the one-round protocols.*

Proof First we note that at any stage of the protocol, A and B always have perfect knowledge about the state that they share at that moment. This is due to the facts that A and B know the initial state φ_{AB} and that the protocol can be assumed to be unitary. Specifically, it is always known what the Schmidt coefficients are of the current state. With this viewpoint it is clear that the communication only serves the purpose of changing these coefficients, everything else can be done locally. A qubit of communication from Bob to Alice will thus establish a transformation $\sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i} |i_A, i_B\rangle \mapsto \sum_i \sqrt{\lambda'_i} |i'_A, i'_B\rangle$, written in the Schmidt decomposition of the prior and posterior state. By symmetry, this same transformation $\lambda_i \mapsto \lambda'_i$ can also be implemented by a qubit of communication from Alice to Bob. Hence, in general, all communication from Bob to Alice can be replaced by an equal amount of communication in the opposite direction. $\square$

This argument is very similar to the one given by Lo and Popescu [19] to reduce the study of multi-round LOCC (Local Operations and Classical Communication) state transformation protocols to single round protocols.

This lemma also points to a connection with another basic question about quantum states. Suppose Alice and Bob initially share a tripartite state $|\varphi_{ACB}\rangle$, with Alice in possession of A and C . If Alice sends subsystem C to Bob, then her reduced density operator changes from φ_{AC} to φ_A . Thus, the problem of state transformation is intimately connected to the question of determining the effect of a partial trace operation on a density operator's spectrum. While the general answer to this question is unknown, Nielsen and Kempe [23] have found some partial results for the case where φ_{AC} is separable.

3.3 Difference between $\bar{Q}$ and $\bar{Q}^{(*)}$?

Is there a difference between the transformation complexities $\bar{Q}$ and $\bar{Q}^{(*)}$? Or, in other words, does prior EPR entanglement help? We do not know the answer in the general case, but we do get an indication that the two might be equivalent by looking at the case where the prior state φ_{AB} is not entangled. Recall that the transformation complexity with a prior product state $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle = |\varphi_A\rangle \otimes |\varphi_B\rangle$ is denoted by $\bar{Q}(\psi_{AB}) := \bar{Q}(\psi_{AB}|\varphi_A \otimes \varphi_B)$.

Lemma 3.3 $\bar{Q}_\epsilon(\psi_{AB}) = \bar{Q}_\epsilon^{(*)}(\psi_{AB})$. Hence, by the ‘quantum sampling’ paper [2], $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^{(*)}(\psi_{AB}) = \bar{Q}_\epsilon(\psi_{AB}) = \bar{Q}_\epsilon(\psi_{AB}) = \log(\text{rank}_{1-\epsilon}(\psi_A))$, where $\text{rank}_{1-\epsilon}(\psi_A)$ is the size of the smallest subset of eigenvalues of ψ_A summing to at least $1 - \epsilon$.

Proof Let $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r)$ be the spectrum of the Schmidt decomposition of ψ_{AB} . Assume that the optimal EPR-assisted protocol uses the k -level state $|\Phi_{AB}^k\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{j=1}^k |j, j\rangle$, such that the spectrum change of this protocol is described by $(\frac{1}{k}, \dots, \frac{1}{k}) \mapsto (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r) \otimes (\frac{1}{k}, \dots, \frac{1}{k}) \equiv (\frac{\lambda_1}{k}, \dots, \frac{\lambda_1}{k}, \frac{\lambda_2}{k}, \dots, \frac{\lambda_r}{k})$, where we reshuffled the amplitudes in nonincreasing order. To get an approximating spectrum with no more than ϵ error to this last state, we need a final state with rank at least $k \cdot \text{rank}_{(1-\epsilon)}(\psi_{AB})$. Because we start with a rank k state Φ_{AB}^k we see that we need at least $\log(\text{rank}_{(1-\epsilon)}(\psi_{AB}))$ qubits of communication, which is also an upper bound on $\dot{Q}_\epsilon(\psi_{AB}) := \bar{Q}_\epsilon(\psi_{AB})$ (see [2]). $\square$

4 Lower bounds on $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^{(*)}$

In this section we will use the properties of the Rényi entropies [26] to prove bounds on the transformation complexity in the presence of maximally entangled states.

4.1 Rényi entropy

Definition 4.1 Given a density matrix ρ with spectrum $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r$, its Rényi entropy $S_\alpha(\rho)$ is defined to be

$$S_\alpha(\rho) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log(\text{Tr } \rho^\alpha) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i^\alpha \right) \quad (4)$$

for every $0 < \alpha < \infty$, $\alpha \neq 1$. Furthermore, for the values $\alpha = 0, 1, \infty$ we define $S_0(\rho) = \log(\text{rank}(\rho))$, $S_1(\rho) = -\text{Tr}(\rho \log \rho)$ and $S_\infty(\rho) = -\log(\lambda_1)$. Note that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \alpha} S_x(\rho) = S_\alpha(\rho)$.

We have already encountered S_1 , which is just the von Neumann entropy S . The other exceptional orders, 0 and ∞ , are, likewise, quantities that appear frequently in quantum information theory and communication complexity. The following theorem summarizes the basic properties of the Rényi entropies.

Theorem 4.2 Let ρ be a density operator with spectrum $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r$. The following properties hold for all α :

1. The inequalities $0 \leq S_\alpha(\rho) \leq \log \text{rank}(\rho)$ hold.
2. For $\alpha \neq 0$, the entropy is maximized if and only if $\lambda_i = \frac{1}{r}$.
3. The entropy is minimized only by pure states.
4. (Additivity) For two density matrices: $S_\alpha(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) = S_\alpha(\rho_1) + S_\alpha(\rho_2)$.
5. If $\alpha \leq \beta$ then $S_\alpha(\rho) \geq S_\beta(\rho)$.
6. (Schur concavity) If $\rho \succ \sigma$ then $S_\alpha(\rho) \leq S_\alpha(\sigma)$.

The notation $\rho \succ \sigma$ means that spectrum of the operator ρ majorizes the spectrum of σ . That is, if σ has eigenvalues $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 \geq \dots \geq \gamma_r$ then $\sum_{j=1}^l \lambda_j \geq \sum_{j=1}^l \gamma_j$ for all $1 \leq l \leq r$.

It is less well-known that the Rényi entropies obey a weak form of subadditivity, which will be crucial for proving bounds on communication. While subadditivity of the form $S(\rho_{AB}) \leq S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B)$ fails for the Rényi entropies unless α is 0 or 1, replacing one of the terms on the right hand side by the logarithm of the rank of ρ_B , that is, by $S_0(\rho_B)$, gives an inequality that holds for all α .

Lemma 4.3 (Weak subadditivity) *Let ρ_{AB} be a bipartite density matrix. For all α , the Rényi entropy of the states is bounded by*

$$S_\alpha(\rho_A) - S_0(\rho_B) \leq S_\alpha(\rho_{AB}) \leq S_\alpha(\rho_A) + S_0(\rho_B).$$

Proof We will first prove the upper bound on $S_\alpha(\rho_{AB})$ and then show how the lower bound follows. Let $\{|i_A\rangle\}$ be the eigenbasis of the reduced density operator ρ_A and consider the projection

$$P(\rho_{AB}) = \sum_i |i_A\rangle\langle i_A| \otimes \langle i_A|\rho_{AB}|i_A\rangle.$$

Since P is a doubly stochastic mapping and the Rényi entropies are all Schur-concave, we have $S_\alpha(\rho_{AB}) \leq S_\alpha(P(\rho_{AB}))$. We begin by assuming that $\alpha \neq 0, 1, \infty$; the exceptional values will follow by continuity. Also, we will use the notation $\lambda_i = \text{Tr}(\langle i_A|\rho_{AB}|i_A\rangle)$ and $\rho_i = \langle i_A|\rho_{AB}|i_A\rangle/\lambda_i$, such that $P(\rho_{AB}) = \sum_i \lambda_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \rho_i$. Next, observe that

$$\text{sign}(1 - \alpha) \cdot \text{Tr}(\rho_i^\alpha) \leq \text{sign}(1 - \alpha) \cdot (\text{rank}(\rho_i))^{1-\alpha} \quad (5)$$

for all α , which is the last ingredient required to finish the proof of the upper bound:

$$S_\alpha(P(\rho_{AB})) = S_\alpha(\sum_i \lambda_i |i_A\rangle\langle i_A| \otimes \rho_i) \quad (6)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log(\text{Tr}[(\sum_i \lambda_i |i_A\rangle\langle i_A| \otimes \rho_i)^\alpha]) \quad (7)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log(\sum_i \lambda_i^\alpha \text{Tr} \rho_i^\alpha) \quad (8)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log(\sum_i \lambda_i^\alpha (\text{rank}(\rho_i))^{1-\alpha}) \quad (9)$$

$$\leq S_\alpha(\rho_A) + \log \text{rank}(\rho_B). \quad (10)$$

The last line follows from the fact that $\text{Tr}_B(P(\rho_{AB})) = \rho_A$ so that the λ_i are just the eigenvalues of ρ_A , and the fact that $\text{rank}(\rho_i) \leq \text{rank}(\rho_B)$.

The lower bound is a straightforward consequence of the upper bound. Given ρ_{AB} , let ψ_{ABR} be a pure state such that $\text{Tr}_R \psi_{ABR} = \rho_{AB}$, and hence $\text{Spec}(\rho_A) = \text{Spec}(\psi_{BR})$ and $\text{Spec}(\rho_{AB}) = \text{Spec}(\psi_R)$. The upper bound reads $S_\alpha(\psi_{BR}) \leq S_\alpha(\psi_R) + \log \text{rank}(\psi_B)$, which is equivalent to

$$S_\alpha(\rho_A) - \log \text{rank}(\rho_B) \leq S_\alpha(\rho_{AB}). \quad (11)$$

The $\alpha = \infty$ case is proven via the equality $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} S_x(\rho) = S_\infty(\rho)$. $\square$

There is an alternative method of proving lemma 4.3 that builds on known results about state transformations. Let $|\varphi_{ACB}\rangle$ be a tripartite pure state, with Alice in possession of the shares A and C . One way for Alice to send system C to Bob would be to first send him half a maximally entangled state of rank $k := \text{rank}(\varphi_C)$ and then to teleport [4] system C using that maximally entangled state. Since teleportation is an LOCC protocol, Alice's final reduced density operator φ_A must majorize the operator $\varphi_{AC} \otimes \text{diag}(1/k, \dots, 1/k)$ [21]. Since the Rényi entropies are Schur concave, we can deduce the left-hand inequality of lemma 4.3.

4.2 Rényi-entropic bounds on communication

The following lemma is the starting point for proving bounds on the approximate transformation complexity. Namely, it bounds the minimum number of qubits that need to be exchanged in order to succeed in an exact transformation.

Lemma 4.4 *Let $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle$ and $|\psi_{AB}\rangle$ be bipartite pure states. If there exists a protocol for converting $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle$ to $|\psi_{AB}\rangle$ using n qubits of communication, then $n \geq S_\alpha(\psi_A) - S_\alpha(\varphi_A)$, for all α .*

Proof The most general protocol consists of k rounds of communication, separated by arbitrary completely positive, trace-preserving operations performed locally by Alice and Bob. Since each of these local operations can be implemented by adjoining a pure ancilla state, applying a unitary and then discarding part of the system, we can assume without loss of generality that the first step of the protocol consists of adjoining pure, separable ancilla, that each local operation by Alice or Bob is unitary and that the discard steps are all postponed to the end of the protocol. We will now analyze each of these three phases in turn. Adjoining separable ancilla does not affect the non-zero part of the spectrum of the reduced density operator, or, therefore, the Rényi entropy. The second phase, by lemma 3.2, can be assumed to consist of a single round of communication from Alice to Bob. By the weak subadditivity of the Rényi entropy, the increase in S_α at this step is no more than the number of qubits of communication. Finally, at the discard step, by the additivity of the Rényi entropies over tensor products, S_α is non-increasing. $\square$

While lemma 4.4 is itself a consequence of the Schur concavity of the Rényi entropies and Nielsen's theorem [21], by making further use of the properties of the Rényi entropies, it can be adapted to study questions that Nielsen's theorem does not address, like the amount of classical communication required to perform entanglement dilution [12].

The following lemma gives *dimension-independent* estimates of the Rényi entropy for states that are close together. In contrast, the analogous result for the von Neumann entropy, known as the Fannes inequality [10], has a logarithmic dependence on the rank of the states.

Lemma 4.5 *Let $F(\rho, \sigma) > 1 - \epsilon$. For all $1/2 \leq \alpha < 1$ the Rényi entropies of order α of ρ are bounded below by*

$$S_\alpha(\rho) \geq S_\beta(\sigma) + \frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha} \log(1-\epsilon),$$

where $\beta = \infty$ if $\alpha = 1/2$ and $\beta = \alpha/(2\alpha - 1)$ otherwise.

Proof It can be shown [11] that $F(\rho, \sigma)$ is the minimum over all measurements $\{M_i\}$ of the function $\sum_i \sqrt{\text{Tr}(M_i \rho) \text{Tr}(M_i \sigma)}$. Choosing $\{M_i\}$ to be projection in a basis that diagonalizes ρ yields $F(\rho, \sigma) \leq \sum_i (\lambda_i \omega_i)^{1/2}$, where $\omega_i = \text{Tr}(M_i \sigma)$ and $\{\lambda_i\}$ is the spectrum of ρ . When $\alpha > 1/2$, an application of Hölder's inequality, which states that $\sum_i x_i y_i \leq (\sum_i x_i^p)^{1/p} (\sum_i y_i^q)^{1/q}$ when $x_i, y_i \geq 0$, $p > 1$ and $1/p + 1/q = 1$, with $p = 2\alpha/(2\alpha - 1)$ and $q = 2\alpha$, yields

$$\log(1-\epsilon) \leq \frac{2\alpha-1}{2\alpha} \log \sum_i \omega_i^{\alpha/(2\alpha-1)} + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \log \sum_i \lambda_i^\alpha$$

upon taking logarithms on both sides. Because the ω_i are outcome probabilities of a projective measurement, the vector (ω_i) is majorized by the spectrum of σ [1]. The Schur concavity of the Rényi entropies then implies that $S_\beta(\omega_i) \geq S_\beta(\sigma)$, completing the proof of the lemma for $\alpha \neq 1/2$. The $\alpha = 1/2$ case follows by taking limits. $\square$

Because the previous result makes no reference to the rank of the states ρ and σ , it can be combined with lemma 4.4 to yield a family of bounds on the transformation complexity in the presence of unlimited amounts of entanglement. These bounds, in turn, provide a convenient way to derive bounds on the quantum communication complexity of distributed function evaluation.

Theorem 4.6 *For any bipartite pure state $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle$ and $|\psi_{AB}\rangle$, and any $1/2 \leq \alpha < 1$, the transformation complexity obeys the inequality*

$$\bar{Q}_\epsilon^{(*)}(\psi_{AB}|\varphi_{AB}) \geq S_\beta(\psi_A) - S_\alpha(\varphi_A) + \frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha} \log(1-\epsilon), \quad (12)$$

where $\beta = \infty$ if $\alpha = 1/2$ and $\beta = \alpha/(2\alpha - 1)$ otherwise.

Proof Suppose that there exists a maximally entangled state $|\Phi_{AB}^k\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{j=1}^k |j, j\rangle$ and an n -qubit protocol for transforming $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle \otimes |\Phi_{AB}^k\rangle$ into the state $|\rho_{AB}\rangle$ where $F(\psi_{AB} \otimes \Phi_{AB}^k, \rho_{AB}) \geq 1 - \epsilon$. By the monotonicity of the fidelity, it then follows that also $F(\psi_A \otimes \Phi_A^k, \rho_A) \geq 1 - \epsilon$, and thus, according to lemma 4.5, $S_\alpha(\rho_A) \geq S_\beta(\psi_A) + \log k + \frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha} \log(1-\epsilon)$. Using $S_\alpha(\varphi_A \otimes \Phi_A^k) = S_\alpha(\varphi_A) + \log k$, lemma 4.4 proves that the conversion from $\varphi_{AB} \otimes \Phi_{AB}^k$ to ρ_{AB} requires at least $S_\beta(\psi_A) - S_\alpha(\varphi_A) + \frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha} \log(1-\epsilon)$ qubits of communication, regardless of the dimension k . $\square$

Note that the above proof relies critically on the fact that for the maximally entangled state $S_\beta(\Phi_A^k) - S_\alpha(\Phi_A^k) = 0$, which does not hold for general states.

It should be pointed out that similar lower bounds can be derived from other techniques from quantum information theory, such as those of Ref. [28]. In practice, however, the ease with which the Rényi entropies are calculated and manipulated can result in significant simplification over approaches based on majorization.

5 Quantum Lower Bounds on Communication Complexity

In this section we will use our results on the complexity of state transformations to obtain similar lower bounds on the communication complexity of functions.

Definition 5.1 *For a function $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}$ the rectangle R_f is defined by $R_{xy} := f(x, y)$ for all $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. The two marginal density matrices of the function f are $\rho_f^X := \frac{1}{|X||Y|} R_f R_f^T$ and $\rho_f^Y := \frac{1}{|X||Y|} R_f^T R_f$. The eigenvalue spectrum $\sigma(f)$ of f is the spectrum of the marginal density matrix of f (the spectra of ρ_f^X and ρ_f^Y are the same).*

It is easy to prove that the bipartite state

$$|\psi_{AB}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|X||Y|}} \sum_{x \in X, y \in Y} f(x, y) |x, y\rangle \quad (13)$$

will have marginal density matrices ρ_f^X and ρ_f^Y , and hence $S_\beta(\sigma(f)) = S_\beta(\psi_A) = S_\beta(\psi_B)$.

These definitions allow us to formulate the following theorem.

Theorem 5.2 *Let $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ be a distributed function. The communication complexity $Q_\epsilon^{(*)}(f)$ is lower bounded by*

$$Q_\epsilon^{(*)}(f) \geq \frac{1}{2} S_\beta(\sigma(f)) + \frac{\beta}{\beta-1} \log(1 - 2\epsilon), \quad (14)$$

for every $\beta > 1$. This lower bound applies to the uniform distribution $\mu(x, y) := 1/|X||Y|$ over the input values.

Proof We know by lemma 2.4 that if we define φ and ψ according to

$$|\varphi_{AB}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|X||Y|}} \sum_{x \in X, y \in Y} |x_A\rangle |y_B\rangle, \quad (15)$$

$$|\psi_{AB}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|X||Y|}} \sum_{x \in X, y \in Y} f(x, y) |x_A\rangle |y_B\rangle, \quad (16)$$

we have $Q_\epsilon^{(*)}(f) \geq \frac{1}{2} \bar{Q}_{2\epsilon}^{(*)}(\psi_{AB} | \varphi_{AB})$. Because φ_{AB} is a disentangled state with $S_\alpha(\varphi_A) = 0$ and $S_\beta(\psi_A) = S_\beta(\sigma(f))$, we use theorem 4.6 to complete the proof. $\square$

5.1 The Inner Product Function

As an example, we will apply the lower bound of the previous section to determine the quantum communication complexity of the inner product function, which is defined for two n -bit strings $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ by

$$\text{IP}(x, y) := \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i \pmod{2}. \quad (17)$$

In the exact case with prior entanglement, it has been shown that $Q_0^*(\text{IP}) = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$ [8]. The speedup of a factor of 2 is achieved using superdense coding, which is applicable to every function. In the bounded-error case, however, the known bounds are considerably weaker. In the same paper, the lower bound $Q_\epsilon^*(\text{IP}) \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 - 2\epsilon)^2 n - \frac{1}{2}$, has a scaling factor in front of the linear term n that depends on the error rate ϵ . This is in sharp contrast with the lower bound for the model where no prior entanglement is allowed [2]: $Q_\epsilon(\text{IP}) \geq \frac{n}{2} + \log(1 - 2\epsilon)$.

Here we will generalize this inequality to the setting where A and B are allowed to use an arbitrary amount of EPR-pairs.

Theorem 5.3 *The EPR-enhanced communication complexity of the inner product function is bounded by*

$$\frac{n}{2} + \log(1 - 2\epsilon) \leq Q_\epsilon^{(*)}(\text{IP}) \leq \max\left(0, \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \log(1 - 2\epsilon) \right\rceil\right). \quad (18)$$

This result, we should emphasize, only holds if the entangled state shared by Alice and Bob is restricted to be of the form $|\Phi^k\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{j=1}^k |j, j\rangle$. In independent work, Nayak and Salzman, using a different technique than the one we have employed here, have recently shown that the lower bound actually holds for $Q_\epsilon^*(\text{IP})$ as well [20].

To prove the lower bound we use our earlier theorem 5.2 in combination with the knowledge that the rectangle R_{IP} is an orthogonal matrix such that $\rho_{\text{IP}}^X = \frac{1}{2^n} I$. As a result, $S_\beta(\sigma(\text{IP})) = n$ for all β and the lower bound follows by taking the limit $\beta \rightarrow \infty$.

For the upper bound consider q qubits of communication used in a superdense coding scheme such that Alice can send Bob $2q$ bits of information about her n -bit input string. Bob can then guess the value of x on Alice's remaining $n - 2q$ bits, expecting to be correct with probability 2^{2q-n} . On the occasions that he has guessed correctly, he can evaluate IP without error, otherwise, he can expect to be correct half the time. Therefore, the probability of success for the resulting protocol will be $1 - \epsilon \geq 2^{2q-n} + \frac{1}{2}(1 - 2^{2q-n})$. Taking logarithms then reveals that for this protocol: $q \leq \frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \log(1 - 2\epsilon)$.

Observe also that any protocol that uses prior entanglement and classical communication (with complexity measure $C_\epsilon^*(\text{IP})$) can be simulated at half the cost using superdense coding and that the optimal quantum protocol constructed here simply involves one-way communication from Alice to Bob. It follows that $C_\epsilon^*(\text{IP}) \geq 2Q_\epsilon^{(*)}(\text{IP}) = n + 2\log(1 - 2\epsilon)$.

5.2 Lower Bound for a Promise Function

Consider the distributed function $g : \mathbb{F}_q \times \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}$ that is defined for all $x \neq y$ as the *quadratic character* of the difference between x and $y \in \mathbb{F}_q$:

$$g(x, y) := \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } x - y \text{ is a square in } \mathbb{F}_q, \\ -1 & \text{if } x - y \text{ is not a square in } \mathbb{F}_q. \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

(See [13] for the various properties of quadratic characters.) Here we will give an almost tight lower bound on the communication complexity $Q_\epsilon^{(*)}$ of this function using the Rényi entropic methods of the previous sections.

First we should note that g is not defined on all input pairs (x, y) , which means that g is an example of a ‘promise function’. Because of this, we cannot directly apply the lower bound method of theorem 5.2 as this assumes the uniform prior distribution over the input states. Instead, we will have to prove our lower bound for the correlated distribution $\mu(x, y) = \frac{1}{q(q-1)}$ for $x \neq y$, and $\mu(x, x) = 0$. Fortunately this is possible with the help of theorem 4.6, which can deal with initial entangled states φ_{AB} .

Theorem 5.4 *Let $g : \mathbb{F}_q \times \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}$ be the function defined in Equation 19. The EPR-enhanced communication complexity of this quadratic character function is bounded*

$$\log(q-1) - 2 + 2\log(1-\epsilon) \leq Q_\epsilon^{(*)}(g) \leq \lceil \log(q) \rceil. \quad (20)$$

Specifically, the lower bound applies to the distribution: $\mu(x, y) = \frac{1}{q(q-1)}$ for $x \neq y$ and $\mu(x, x) = 0$ over the $q(q-1)$ input pairs (x, y) .

Proof The upper bound is trivial: the set $\mathbb{F}_q$ has q elements, hence $\lceil \log q \rceil$ bits are sufficient for Bob to transmit the value of y to Alice.

For the lower bound, define the initial and final states φ and ψ

$$|\varphi_{AB}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q(q-1)}} \sum_{x \neq y \in \mathbb{F}_q} |x_A\rangle |y_B\rangle, \quad (21)$$

$$|\psi_{AB}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q(q-1)}} \sum_{x \neq y \in \mathbb{F}_q} g(x, y) |x_A\rangle |y_B\rangle. \quad (22)$$

For the quadratic character the following ‘shift property’ holds (see [13]):

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} g(x+r)g(x+s) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } s \neq r, \\ q-1 & \text{if } s = r. \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

It is thus not hard to see that the marginal density matrices of the two states are $\varphi_A = \frac{1}{q(q-1)}[I + (q-2)J]$ and $\psi_A = \frac{1}{q(q-1)}[qI - J]$, where I is the q -dimensional identity matrix, and J is the ‘all ones’ matrix of the same dimension. The respective spectra are thus $\sigma(\varphi_A) = (1 - \frac{1}{q}, \frac{1}{q(q-1)}, \dots, \frac{1}{q(q-1)})$

and $\sigma(\psi_A) = (\frac{1}{q-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{q-1}, 0)$. With this knowledge we can employ the lower bound of Theorem 4.6. For $(\alpha, \beta) = (\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ the entropies of the two spectra are $S_\infty(\psi_A) = \log(q-1)$ and $S_{1/2}(\varphi_A) = \log(4 - \frac{4}{p}) < 2$, and hence indeed $\bar{Q}_\epsilon^{(*)}(\psi_{AB}|\varphi_{AB}) \geq \log(q-1) - 2 + 2\log(1-\epsilon)$. $\square$

Acknowledgments

WvD is supported by an HP/MSRI postdoctoral fellowship, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) and the Air Force Laboratory, Air Force Materiel Command, USAF, under agreement number F30602-01-2-0524. PH is supported by a Sherman Fairchild fellowship and US National Science Foundation grant no. EIA-0086038.

References

- [1] P. M. Alberti and A. Uhlmann. *Stochasticity and partial order*. Dordrecht, Boston, 1982.
- [2] A. Ambainis, L. J. Schulman, A. Ta-Shma, U. V. Vazirani, and A. Wigderson. The quantum communication complexity of sampling. In *IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pp. 342–351, 1998.
- [3] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu and B. Schumacher. Concentrating partial entanglement by local operations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 54(4):2406–2052, 1996.
- [4] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres and W. K. Wootters. Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen channels. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 70(13):1895–1899, 1993.
- [5] H. Buhrman, W. van Dam, P. Hoyer, and A. Tapp. Multiparty quantum communication complexity. *Phys. Rev. A*, 60:2737–2741, 1999.
- [6] H. Buhrman and R. de Wolf. Communication lower bounds by polynomials. In *16th IEEE Annual Conference Computational Complexity*, pp. 120–130, 2001.
- [7] R. Cleve and H. Buhrman, Substituting quantum entanglement for communication. *Phys. Rev. A*, 56(2):1201–1204, 1997.
- [8] R. Cleve, W. van Dam, M. Nielsen, and A. Tapp. Quantum entanglement and the communication complexity of the inner product function. *Lect. Not. Comp. Sci.*, 1509:61–74, 1999.
- [9] W. van Dam and P. Hayden. Embezzling Entangled Quantum States. e-print [quant-ph/0201041](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0201041), 2002.

- [10] M. Fannes. A continuity property of the entropy density for spin lattice systems. *Communications of mathematical physics*, 31:291–294, 1973.
- [11] C. A. Fuchs. *Distinguishability and Accessible Information in Quantum Theory*. PhD thesis, University of New Mexico, 1995.
- [12] P. Hayden and A. Winter. On the communication cost of entanglement transformations. e-print [quant-ph/0204092](#).
- [13] K. Ireland and M. Rosen. *A Classical Introduction to Modern Number Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, 1990.
- [14] D. Jonathan and M. B. Plenio. Entanglement-assisted local manipulation of pure quantum states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 83(17):3566–3569, 1999.
- [15] R. Jozsa. Fidelity for mixed quantum states. *J. Mod. Opt.*, 41(12):2314–2323, 1994.
- [16] H. Klauck. Lower bounds for quantum communication complexity. In *42nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pp. 288–297, 2001.
- [17] I. Kremer. *Quantum communication complexity*, Master’s thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1995.
- [18] E. Kushilevitz and N. Nisan. *Communication Complexity*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [19] H.-K. Lo and S. Popescu. Concentrating entanglement by local actions: Beyond mean values. *Phys. Rev. A*, 63:022301, 2001.
- [20] A. Nayak and J. Salzman. (Private communication.)
- [21] M. A. Nielsen. Conditions for a Class of Entanglement Transformations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 83(2):436–439, 1999.
- [22] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [23] M. A. Nielsen and J. Kempe. Separable states are more disordered globally than locally. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 83:5184–5187, 2001.
- [24] R. Raz. Exponential separation of quantum and classical communication complexity. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pp. 358–367, 1999.
- [25] A. Razborov. Quantum communication complexity of symmetric predicates. e-print [quant-ph/0204025](#), 2002.

- [26] A. Rényi. On measures of entropy and information. In J. Neyman, editor, *Proceedings of the fourth Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability*, vol. 1, pp. 547–561, Berkeley, CA, 1961. University of California Press.
- [27] A. Uhlmann, “The transition probability in the state space of a $*$ -algebra”, *Rep. Math. Phys.*, 9:273–279, 1976.
- [28] G. Vidal, D. Jonathan, and M. A. Nielsen. Approximate transformations and robust manipulation of bipartite pure-state entanglement. *Phys. Rev. A*, 62:012304, 2000.
- [29] A. C. Yao. Some complexity questions related to distributed computing. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, pp. 209–213, 1979.
- [30] A. C. Yao. Quantum Circuit Complexity. *Proceedings of the 34th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pp. 352–361, 1993.